

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated July 3, 2008, has been received and carefully considered. Reconsideration of the current rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.<sup>1</sup>

I. THE WRITTEN DESCRIPTION REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 3-11

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 3-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that the claim element "whitening the at least one encrypted message block with a second mask value, which is not identical to the first mask value, to generate at least one corresponding output ciphertext block" is not supported by the specification. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, Applicant refers to page 13, lines 5-13, of Applicant's specification, which recites:

---

<sup>1</sup> As Applicant(s)'s remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicant(s)'s silence as to assertions made by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., assertions regarding dependent claims, whether a reference constitutes prior art, whether references are legally combinable for obviousness purposes) is not a concession by Applicant(s) that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicant(s) reserve(s) the right to analyze and dispute such in the future.

the method 600 employs two masks  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  that are computed (step 610) based on the two last blocks of value E and vector P. Referring to Figure 7A, if n represents the number of plaintext blocks on input, then  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are computed by applying a XOR function 410 to the corresponding blocks of E and P and then applying a SUBST function 420 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}M_1 &= \text{SUBST}(P_{n+1} \text{ XOR } E_{n+1}) \\M_2 &= \text{SUBST}(P_{n+2} \text{ XOR } E_{n+2})\end{aligned}$$

This recitation clearly indicates that the first and second mask values,  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ , respectively, are computed based upon different P and E values. Also, page 10, lines 25-27, of Applicant's specification, which recites:

if  $U_i$  represents the  $i^{\text{th}}$  counter value, then  
the  $i^{\text{th}}$  value of P is computed as follows:  
 $P_i = \text{Encrypt}(K_2, U_i)$ , ( $i = 1, 2, \dots n+2$ )

This recitation clearly indicates that the vector P is computed based upon different counter values U. Further, page 11, lines 17-19, of Applicant's specification, which recites:

the value, E, is derived by encrypted N  
using the block cipher 210 and the key  $K_1$ .  
Thus, E is an extension of key  $K_1$ .

This recitation clearly indicates that the value E is computed based upon different NONCE values N. Further still, claim 1 recites that the first and second keys,  $K_1$  and  $K_2$ , respectively, have different values. Thus, there is clear support in the specification for the first mask value not being identical to the second mask value, as claimed.

At this point it should be noted that, as stated in MPEP § 2163.07(a), by disclosing in a patent application a device that inherently performs a function or has a property, operates according to a theory, or has an advantage, a patent application necessarily discloses that function, theory or advantage, even though it says nothing explicit concerning it. The patent application may later be amended to recite the function, theory, or advantage without introducing prohibited new matter. In re Reynolds, 443 F.2d 384 (CCPA 1971), In re Smythe, 480 F. 2d 1376 (CCPA 1973).

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the aforementioned enablement rejection of claims 1 and 3-11 be withdrawn.

## II. THE OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 3-11

On pages 4-8 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 3-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogaway ("OCB: A Block-Cipher Mode of Operation for Efficient Authenticated Encryption") in view of Schneier ("Applied Cryptography, Second Edition") in further view of Jutla (U.S. Patent No. 7,093,126). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Patent Office bears the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074 (Fed. Cir. 1988). There are four separate factual inquiries to consider in making an obviousness determination: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the level of ordinary skill in the field of the invention; (3) the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art; and (4) the existence of any objective evidence, or "secondary considerations," of non-obviousness. Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966); see also KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007). An "expansive and flexible approach" should be applied when determining obviousness based on a combination of prior art references. KSR, 127 S. Ct. at 1739. However, a claimed invention combining multiple known elements is not rendered obvious simply because each element was known independently in the prior art. Id. at 1741. Rather, there must still be some "reason that would have prompted" a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the elements in the specific way that he or she did. Id.; In re Icon Health & Fitness, Inc., 496 F.3d 1374, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2007). Also, modification of a prior art reference may be obvious only if there exists a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill to make the change. KSR, 127 S. Ct. at 1740-41.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner acknowledges that Rogaway fails to disclose: 1.) first and second keys having different values to encrypt at least one whitened message block and two other separate values to compute first and second mask values, as claimed; 2.) applying a substitution function to compute first and second mask values, as claimed; 3.) whitening unencrypted and encrypted message blocks using first and second mask values that are different, as claimed. However, the Examiner then asserts that the claimed invention would have been obvious in view of Rogaway, Schneier, and Jutla. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Rogaway and the other cited references, taken either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, or even suggest, a parallelizable integrity-aware encryption method comprising:

- whitening at least one message block with a *first mask value*;

- encrypting the at least one whitened message block using a block cipher and a first key; and

- whitening the at least one encrypted message block with a *second mask value*, which is not identical to the first mask value, to generate at least one corresponding output ciphertext block;

- wherein the *first mask value* is computed by applying a XOR function to a first value derived from a NONCE value and a second value derived from encrypting a third value using the block cipher and a second key, and then applying a substitution function to the result of the XOR function;

- wherein the first and second key have different values;

wherein the *second mask* value is computed by applying a XOR function to a fourth value derived from the *NONCE* value and a fifth value derived from encrypting a sixth value using the block cipher and the second key, and then applying the substitution function to the result of the XOR function. (emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits that Rogaway fails to teach, or even suggest a first mask value or a second mask value as recited in claim 1. The generated value in the Rogaway XOR operations alleged by the Examiner to be equivalent to the two claimed whitening operations is the same in both operations. This is quite different from a first mask value and a second mask value that are not identical in value as recited in claim 1.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Rogaway and the other cited references, taken either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, or even suggest, a parallelizable integrity-aware encryption method that includes, *inter alia*, two keys having different values, as presently claimed. In contrast, Rogaway explicitly discloses using a single key (see Rogaway, pg. 8: "One needs a single key, *K*, which keys all invocations of the underlying block cipher."). As mentioned above, the Examiner acknowledges this deficiency of Rogaway (see Office Action, page 5: "Rogaway does not specify that the key used to encrypt the value to generate the '*L*' (page 5) is

different than the key used to encrypt  $M[i] \oplus Z[i]$  (page 5)."). Neither Schneier nor Jutla cure these deficiencies. Indeed, this is not even alleged. Accordingly, is it respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Rogaway, Schneier, and Jutla.

At this point Applicant would like to respectfully note that, as stated in MPEP § 2143.01, obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Further, as stated in MPEP § 2143.01, if the proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Additionally, if the proposed modification or

combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious. In re Ratti, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959).

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious to one reasonably skilled in the art to modify Rogaway to arrive at the claimed invention. Rogaway is sufficiently different from the claimed invention that it would not have been obvious to modify Rogaway to arrive at the claimed invention. Claim 1 recites multiple keys. Rogaway only describes the use of a single key. Claim 1 also recites that the multiple keys have different values. Thus, even if the single key of Rogaway was used multiple times, it is substantially different from the claimed invention because it explicitly recites using a single key value. Rogaway also fails to disclose applying a substitution function to compute first and second mask values, and whitening unencrypted and encrypted message blocks using first and second mask values that are different. Claim 1 explicitly recites these features. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one reasonably skilled in the art to modify Rogaway to arrive at the claimed invention.



Also, Modifying Rogaway to arrive at the claimed invention would render Rogaway unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Indeed, the sheer number of modifications to Rogaway that would be required to arrive at the claimed invention would cause Rogaway to deviate from its intended purpose. For example, Rogaway calls for modest memory requirements and limited pre-processing capability (see Rogaway, pg. 8). Rogaway explicitly discloses that the memory requirements and pre-processing capability are only expanded for limited purposes, such as storing  $L(i)$  values. In this discussion, reference is made to the single key  $(K)$ . There is no teaching of flexibility with respect to  $K$ . Rather, Rogaway reiterates that the key is a single value. Accordingly, any modification away from that single value key frustrates the intended purpose of having the most efficient possible system with modest memory requirements and limited processing capability. Additional modifications with respect to applying a substitution function to compute first and second mask values, and whitening unencrypted and encrypted message blocks using first and second mask values that are different, as recited in claim 1, would only further cause Rogaway to deviate from its intended purpose.

Regarding combining Rogaway with Schneier, such a combination would result in an inoperable methodology since

replacing the result of encrypting of Rogaway with an additional XOR function as mentioned by Schneier would not result in a limited tag length  $\tau$ , which is required by Rogaway.

Regarding combining Rogaway with Jutla, such a combination would also result in an inoperable methodology since, first of all, Rogaway fails to even disclose using any mask values, let alone two different mask values, as claimed. Also, Jutla does not explicitly disclose the use of mask values, let alone two different mask values, as claimed. Further, even if Jutla did disclose two different mask values (which it doesn't), using such two different mask values in Rogaway would not result would not result in a limited tag length  $\tau$ , which is required by Rogaway.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Rogaway, Schneier, and Jutla.

Regarding claims 3-11, these claims are dependent upon independent claim 1. Thus, since independent claim 1 should be allowable as discussed above, claims 3-11 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1. Moreover, these claims recite additional features which are not disclosed, or even suggested, by the cited references taken either alone or in combination.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the aforementioned obviousness rejection of claims 3-11 be withdrawn.

III. THE OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION OF CLAIMS 12-20

On pages 8-11 of the Office Action, claims 12-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogaway ("OCB: A Block-Cipher Mode of Operation for Efficient Authenticated Encryption") in view of Schneier ("Applied Cryptography, Second Edition"). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 12, this claim recites subject matter related to claim 1. Thus, the arguments set forth above with respect to claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 12. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is allowable over Rogaway and Schneier for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Also, the Examiner asserts that the claimed invention would have been obvious in view of the combination of Rogaway and Schneier. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Examiner (see Office Action, pg. 3) alleges that the Rogaway disclosure of concatenating message blocks meets the recited claim 12 element of applying an XOR function to all message blocks of a message

to compute an XOR-sum. The Examiner states "concatenation effectively creates the XOR-sum." Applicant disagrees that the concatenation described in Rogaway meets this claim element. A concatenation operation is very different from an XOR operation in both form and result. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Furthermore, Rogaway also discloses applying a string  $L$  and an offset  $Z[m]$  to one string of a message  $M$  before a block cipher  $E_k$ , as well as applying the same message string  $M[m]$  after the block cipher  $E_k$  (see pages 4-6). This disclosure by Rogaway clearly differs from the claimed invention.

Additionally, Rogaway also discloses applying an offset  $Z[m]$  to a checksum before a block cipher  $E_k$ , and then limiting the block cipher result to a tag length  $\tau$  (see pages 4-6). This disclosure by Rogaway clearly differs from the claimed invention.

Regarding combining Schneier with Rogaway, such a combination would result in an inoperable methodology since replacing the result of encrypting of Rogaway with an additional XOR function as mentioned by Schneier would not result in a limited tag length  $\tau$ , which is required by Rogaway.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12 is allowable over the combination of Rogaway and Schneier.

Regarding claims 13-20, these claims are dependent upon independent claim 12. Thus, since independent claim 12 should be allowable as discussed above, claims 13-20 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 12. Moreover, these claims recite additional features which are not disclosed, or even suggested, by the cited references taken either alone or in combination.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the aforementioned obviousness rejection of claims 12-20 be withdrawn.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number, in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

U.S. Patent Application No.: 10/772,433  
Attorney Docket No.: 57983.000164  
Client Reference No.: 16404ROUS01U

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0206, and please credit any excess fees to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Hunton & Williams LLP

By: 

Thomas E. Anderson

Registration No. 37,063

TEA/vrp

Hunton & Williams LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109  
Telephone: (202) 955-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 778-2201

Date: August 29, 2008